

PHILLIP A. TALBERT
United States Attorney
BRIAN A. FOGERTY
Assistant United States Attorney
501 I Street, Suite 10-100
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 554-2700

Attorneys for Plaintiff
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	2:20-CR-221-WBS
)	
Plaintiff,)	[PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING
)	TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL
v.)	ACT
)	
ARTURO PACHECO,)	
)	JURY TRIAL: August 2, 2022
Defendant.)	TIME: 9:00 a.m.
)	COURT: Hon. William B. Shubb
)	

ORDER

On February 14, 2022, the parties appeared before the Court for a Status Hearing. At the hearing, the Court set the matter for a jury trial to begin on August 2, 2022. At the hearing, the parties agreed that time should be excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] between February 14, 2022, and August 2, 2022, based on defense preparation for trial and the unavailability of defense counsel. Counsel for defendant Pacheco represented to the Court that he has several other pending court matters that he will need to handle before and while preparing for the August 2, 2022 jury trial. In addition, counsel for defendant Pacheco advised the United States that additional preparation time is necessary for defense counsel to meet with the defendant, review more than 9,000 pages of discovery, and prepare for trial in this matter.

1 Accordingly, the Court ORDERS that based on the representations made at the February 14,
2 2022 Status Hearing, the ends of justice served by continuing the case as requested outweigh the
3 interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy
4 Trial Act.

5 Therefore, for the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et
6 seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of February 14, 2022, to August 2, 2022,
7 inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) [Local Code T4] because
8 it results from a continuance granted by the Court at defendant's request on the basis of the Court's
9 finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public
10 and the defendant in a speedy trial.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated:

HON. WILLIAM B. SHUBB
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE